



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,078	01/21/2004	Klass P. Hardeman	047446/273072	4620
826	7590	09/12/2007	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			CRANE, LAWRENCE E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/762,078	HARDEMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	L. E. Crane	1623	

All Participants:

(1) L. E. Crane.

(2) Jeffrey Childers.

Status of Application: Response to F. Rej. filed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 September 2007

Time: ~ 6 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Possible art rejection in view of Haystead et al., cited in Graves et al..

Claims discussed:

1 and 31-33 specifically.

Prior art documents discussed:

Haystead et al. and Graves et al.


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Applicant was advised that the instant claims appeared to avoid the prior art in part, but that the disclosure in Haystead et al. appeared to read on claim 1. A return telephone call was requested to discuss this case further and determine whether an advisory action is necessary. .